

## UNITED STATES PARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trad mark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
09/652,770	08/31/00	PUMM		К	6103-0121	
-		@M02/1004	コ	EXAMINER		
BRYAN K WHEELOCK				WALTON,	G	
DOEPKEN KEEVICAN & WEISS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
15TH FLOOR DNE METROPOL 3T LOUIS MO		Ξ		3753	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 



## Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/652,770 Applicant(s)

PUMM et al

Examiner

Art Unit

		George L. Walton	3753
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the corre	spondence address
Period 1	for Reply		
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH	H(S) FROM
af	isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communion period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days	cation.	, , , , ,
be	considered timely.		
co	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory mmunication.		-
	e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b reply received by the Office later than three months after th		
	rned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status 1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
2a) 🗌		tion is non-final.	
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prose	
Disposi	tion of Claims		
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-36</u>	is/ar	e pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/a	re withdrawn from consideration.
5) 💢	Claim(s) 17-24 and 27-32		is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1-5, 8-10, 25, 26, and 33		is/are rejected.
7) 💢	Claim(s) 6, 7, 11-16, and 34-36		
8ັ)□	Claims	are subject to restri	ction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers		
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10)□	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e objected to by the Examiner.	
11)□	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) $\square$ approved	b)□ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
13)□	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d).
a) [	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have		
	2. U Certified copies of the priority documents ha		
	<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the action for a l</li></ol>	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n this National Stage
-	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	·	l(e).
	-	. ,	• •
Attachm	ent(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	101 Intension: Common (DTO 440) 5	- Ala/al
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Pape 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application	
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)2	20) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/652,770

Art Unit: 3753

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the

invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 8-10, 25-26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Reinicke (5,404,908 or 5,450,871). The single coil is readable on element 10, the bar is readable

on element 25 and the two operators are readable on elements 26-27. It is obvious that the two coil

sections are readable on the coil sections on opposite sides of element 25. The sleeves are readable

on element 60. Note that the limitation of claim 3 is a matter of design choice in view of the bar 25

and the sleeve 60. The limitation of claims 5 and 10 are a matter of obvious design expedient in view

of the above discussed elements. Also, the divider is readable on the rod. Note the base is readable

on elements 30 and a portion of element 60. The bobbin is readable on the element that encloses the

coil 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-7, 11-16 and 34-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

Page 3

Art Unit: 3753

claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 17-24 are 27-32 allowed.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George L. Walton whose telephone number is (703) 308-2596.

GEORGE L. WALTON

PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER - 3700** 

**ART UNIT - 3753** 

**GLW** 

September 30, 2001